

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 7, 2009, which set a three-month period for response. Filed herewith is a Request for a Three-month Extension of Time, making this amendment due by October 7, 2009.

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the specification, drawings, and claims 4 and 10 were objected to for informalities. Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,538,352 to Asao.

In the present amendment, the specification was amended to address the objection, to delete reference to the claims and to provide standard headings.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, claim 4 has been amended to correct an inadvertent translation error, thus obviating both the objections to the drawings and to claim 4. The corrected language of claim 4 corresponds to the relevant disclosure in the specification.

Claim 10 likewise was amended to address the objection by including further limitations from page 12, lines 18-20 of the specification. Further support can be found in Figs. 3 and 5a.

To more clearly define the present invention over the cited reference to Asao, claim 1 was amended to further define a rotor with a shaft and a rectifier, *wherein an electrical connection connects the winding ends (78) and the rectifier with one another, and wherein the electrical connection is disposed in a rotor*

rotation axis direction underneath the voltage regulator assembly (65). Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in Figs. 2 and 3 and in the specification on page 6, first and second paragraphs, and on page 8, lines 4-18.

In contrast to Asao, the electrical connections between the winding ends and the rectifier are not disposed between the rectifier and the rotor 7 or blower 5, but instead are disposed under the voltage regulator assembly in the rotor rotation axis direction. This has the advantage that a greater volume throughput through the rectifier is possible and therefore, as result, the rectifier can be cooled better.

Because amended claim 1 includes features that are not disclosed by Asao, the rejection under Section 102 must be withdrawn. The Applicants further submits that Asao is not a proper reference under 35 USC 102 pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the last paragraph of MPEP section 2131, where it is stated that “*a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference*”, and that “*the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*”. Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. ***Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.***, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The application in its amended state is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much

welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 27233

103 East Neck Road

Huntington, New York 11743

631-549-4700